

Observing Each Other's Observations in the Electronic Mail Game¹

Dominik Grafenhofer

*Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods, Kurt-Schumacher-Str. 10, 53113
Bonn, Germany. Email: grafenhofer@coll.mpg.de.*

Wolfgang Kuhle

*Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods, Kurt-Schumacher-Str. 10, 53113
Bonn, Germany. Email: kuhle@coll.mpg.de.*

Abstract: *We study a Bayesian coordination game where agents receive private information on the game's payoff structure. In addition, agents receive private signals on each other's private information. We show that once agents possess these different types of information, there exists a coordination game in the evaluation of this information. And even though the precisions of both signal types is exogenous, the precision with which agents predict each other's actions at equilibrium turns out to be endogenous. As a consequence, we find that there exist multiple equilibria if the private signals' precision is high. These equilibria differ with regard to the way that agents weight their private information to reason about each other's actions.*

Keywords: Coordination Games, Equilibrium Selection, Primary Signals, Secondary Signals

This version: January 6, 2015

1 Introduction

It is the nature of coordination games that one player's payoff depends not only on his own action, but also on the action of others. And if players can observe each other's actions, this interdependence induces multiple equilibria. The same is not necessarily true in environments where agents have only probabilistic knowledge over each other's

¹We thank Martin Hellwig for comments and for spotting an error. We also received helpful comments and questions from Brian Cooper and seminar participants in Bonn.

actions. Harsanyi (1973) and Selten (1975) develop frameworks where one player cannot observe the other player's payoffs, respectively, where players may “tremble”, and show that the number of equilibria can be drastically reduced. Such imperfect knowledge regarding the other player's actions arises naturally in the games of Rubinstein (1989) and Carlsson and van Damme (1993), where both players receive noisy private information over an unknown coefficient that characterizes the game's payoffs. In such models, players face payoff uncertainty as in Harsanyi (1973). At the same time, due to their imperfect private knowledge of the payoffs, they tremble as in Selten (1975). Moreover, the models of Rubinstein (1989) and Carlsson and van Damme (1993) predict that players will play a unique risk-dominant equilibrium rather than the multiple equilibria that they would play if actions and payoffs were common knowledge. The present paper studies this selection mechanism in the context of a more general information structure. We show that once agents possess different types of private information, there exists a coordination game in the evaluation of this information. And even though the precisions of both signal types is exogenous, the precision with which agents predict each other's actions at equilibrium turns out to be endogenous. As a consequence, there exist multiple equilibria if the private signals' precision is high.

More precisely, the players of Rubinstein (1989) and Carlsson and van Damme (1993) reason only indirectly about each other. They receive a signal regarding the game's payoffs, which they use to update their beliefs regarding the game's coefficients. Second, knowing that the other agent's signal is *correlated* with their own, they use their signal to infer the other player's posterior beliefs. In the present paper, we argue that players usually know more than that. Often players can observe *directly* parts of the other player's observation. That is, in the context of the coordinated attack interpretation of the Rubinstein (1989) “electronic mail game”, the general may observe that his messenger is off to a “good start” since he already managed to cross the first valley. Thus, the chances that he eventually arrives at the other camp are better than usual. Put differently, the sender of the “primary message” knows that the other player most likely received a message indicating that a particular game was chosen. Or, alternatively, one general can observe from a distance that someone entered the other general's camp. While he cannot be sure whether it was his messenger or someone else, this observation induces him to revise upward the probability with which the other general received the news. On the

other hand, if the sender sees that the messenger is off to a bad start, then he knows that it is less likely that the message will reach its receiver. The main result of the paper shows that such a generalized information structure induces multiple equilibria. If one player conditions his actions on the “*primary signal*”, which informs him of the particular game chosen by nature, the other player will have an incentive to condition on his “*secondary signal*”, which informs him of the “*primary signal*” that the other player received, and vice versa. Such asymmetric evaluation of signals will maximize the precision with which players can anticipate each other’s actions. That is, even though the precision of both signal types is exogenous, the precision with which agents anticipate each other’s actions at equilibrium turns out to be endogenous. And there will exist multiple equilibria that differ regarding the way that agents weight the different types of private information that they receive, to reason about each other’s actions.

In the present note, we formalize this intuition in the context of the Rubinstein (1989) electronic mail game. First, we introduce the basic information structure, where agents purely rely on the correlation of their private observations to infer the other agent’s beliefs. That is, in equilibrium, agents rely on the fact that they did not receive a confirmation of their last message, which may mean either that their last message did not reach the receiver, or that the receiver’s reply was lost. Within this setting, we recall the main insight, namely that agents play a unique risk-dominant equilibrium. In the following, we refer to the basic signals from the electronic mail game as *primary signals*. In the main part of this note, we introduce a *secondary signal* which allows agents to make additional inference on the other agent’s observations. That is, we introduce a noisy signal that allows players to infer *directly* the probability with which their signal reached the receiver. For the modified setting, we find that if players observe each other’s signal with great precision, then they can coordinate on multiple equilibria.

To interpret our findings, we compare two classes of equilibria: (i) symmetric equilibria and (ii) asymmetric equilibria. The distinguishing feature of a symmetric equilibrium will be that agents weight their two signal types equally. In an asymmetric equilibrium one agent leans heavily on the *secondary signal*, while the other agent has an incentive to lean heavily on his *primary signal* and vice versa. The key feature is therefore that the two signals are “cross complements”. That is, if player one relies heavily on his *secondary signal*, then the other player has an incentive to rely on his *primary signal*. Such an

asymmetric weighting of private signals enables agents to maximize the precision with which they can forecast each other's actions. Finally, to emphasize the importance of the class of asymmetric equilibria, we show that asymmetric equilibria dominate symmetric equilibria on efficiency grounds.

The main contribution of the present paper is the introduction of a new class of private signals. Namely, signals about the other player's signals. Moreover, we show that such information can ensure multiple equilibria once private signals are sufficiently precise. Compared to the literature, we note that Rubinstein (1989), Carlsson and van Damme (1993), and Frankel et al. (2003) have studied two-action coordination games, where agents receive what we call *primary signals* that allow them to make inference on the game's unknown coefficients.² Moreover, through the correlation of private information, agents can reason about each other's posteriors and actions. Regarding equilibrium selection, these studies predict that unique equilibria are ensured once private signals are sufficiently precise. The present example shows that the existence of secondary *private* signals can invert this finding: multiple equilibria are ensured once the private signals are sufficiently precise.

Regarding different types of signals, Morris and Shin (2004), Hellwig (2002), Metz (2002), and Angeletos and Werning (2006) emphasize the role of public signals/common priors in the global games framework, showing that such signals restore equilibrium multiplicity if public signals are sufficiently precise compared to the private signal; we give an example where multiplicity arises in pure private signal environments. A further class of signals was introduced by Minelli and Polemarchakis (2003), Angeletos and Werning (2006), and Dasgupta (2007), who study environments where agents observe each other's actions. Such signals tend to induce unique equilibria in the two-player games of Minelli and Polemarchakis (2003), where signals over each other's actions are perfectly revealing. Angeletos and Werning (2006), and Dasgupta (2007) study public signals that partially reveal the other player's actions. They show that multiplicity may emerge if the public signal is of high quality. Kuhle (2013) gives an example where the public signal's quality reduces the number of equilibria. Finally, Rubinstein (1989) points out that equilibrium multiplicity may

²See Frankel et al. (2003) for a broad literature overview on equilibrium selection through what we call *primary signals*. Carlsson and van Damme (1993), pp. 1008-1010, for a detailed comparison of their "global games", which rely on continuous distributions, with the "electronic mail game" and its discrete information structure.

reemerge once there is a technical upper bound for the number of exchanged messages. Similarly, multiplicity also obtains in the model of Binmore and Samuelson (2001), where agents can *decide* whether or not to send electronic messages which are costly.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines our electronic mail game. In Section 2.1, we recall the uniqueness result for our modified game without secondary signals. Section 3 contains the main result. Section 4 concludes.

2 A symmetric electronic mail game

There are two players 1 and 2. Each has two actions A and B to choose from. And there is uncertainty about which game G_a or G_b the two players are going to play. Games a and b differ regarding their payoffs. Nature selects game a with probability $1 - p$ and game b with probability $p < \frac{1}{2}$. The game's payoff structures are:

	Game G_a			Game G_b	
	A	B		A	B
A	M, M	$0, -L$	A	$0, 0$	$0, -L$
B	$-L, 0$	$0, 0$	B	$-L, 0$	M, M

Moreover, we assume $L > M > 0$. Hence, players face a coordination problem in both states of the world: if players coordinate on actions A (B) in state a (b), they receive M each, while coordination on B (A) yields 0 to both players. However, if players fail to coordinate, i.e., choose different actions, then the player who plays B receives $-L$, and the payoff for playing A is 0. Players receive private information on the game's fundamental before they choose an action. The probability p , the payoff structure, and the forthcoming *communication protocol* are common knowledge among players.

In state a , both players get information $T_1 = T_2 = 0$. In state b , *one player is randomly selected* with probability $\frac{1}{2}$, and informed of the true state b . The selected player i then sends a message to player j . The message, however, is lost with probability ε . Upon receiving a message, player j sends a confirmation back to player i which is also lost with probability ε . These messages are exchanged until finally one message is lost and communication ends. Players 1 and 2 now choose their actions based on the number of messages T_1 and T_2 that they received.

The present game therefore differs from the Rubinstein (1989) game in that it is random which player spots the actual game selected, and starts to inform the other player.

Moreover, we assume that both players do not know who was selected to send the first message.³ This symmetric structure accommodates a more natural interpretation of the *asymmetric* equilibria that players play once we introduce *secondary signals* that inform players about each other's *primary signals* T_1 and T_2 . That is, to bring out the source of multiple asymmetric equilibria, we endow players with signals of identical precisions and, unlike Rubinstein (1989), assume that the probability with which they observe the true state of nature, is the same ($1/2$) across players. The propositions in this paper regarding the existence of multiple asymmetric equilibria continue to hold once we set the probability with which player 1 observes the true state of nature to one as in Rubinstein (1989). Finally, in the context of the coordinated attack interpretation of the electronic mail game, it seems natural that players do not necessarily know that “player 1” always observes the true state of nature first. As such, the present specification may be seen as less restrictive.

2.1 No direct information on the other player's information

Before turning to our main result, we establish the uniqueness result of Rubinstein (1989) for our symmetric mail game.

Proposition 1. *There exists only one equilibrium in which player 1 plays A in the state of nature a . In this equilibrium, both players play A , irrespective of the number of received messages T_1 and T_2 .*

Proof. See Appendix A for the proof by forward induction. □

Proposition 1 recalls the inductive equilibrium selection mechanism that operates through higher-order beliefs: If player 1 plays always A for $T_1 = 0$, then player 2 also plays A , and this equilibrium procreates to games, where $T_i > 0, i = 1, 2$. That is, even though both players $T_i > 0, i = 1, 2$ know that game b was selected, players still play (A, A) , despite the fact that (B, B) would be payoff-dominant. However, as in Rubinstein (1989), there exists a second equilibrium, where both players play (B, B) , receiving a zero payoff both all the time. This equilibrium can be removed once the (B, B) payoff in game G_a is negative, rather than 0, for both players. In this case, there exists only

³In Appendix D, we derive our main result for the original Rubinstein (1989) game, where player 1 is informed of the state of nature with probability 1.

one unique equilibrium, where both players play A . Such a modification of payoffs, which may be introduced throughout the paper, would bring us closer to the formulation of Carlsson and van Damme (1993), where there exist unique strict equilibria for certain signal values.⁴

3 Information on the other player's information

Let us now add a secondary signal Z_1 and Z_2 as another source of private information: player i not only gets information T_i but also observes

$$Z_i := \begin{cases} T_j & \text{with probability } 1 - \psi \\ T_j + 1 & \text{with probability } \psi. \end{cases}$$

The secondary signal Z_1 informs player 1 of the primary signal T_2 that player 2 received. As such, the secondary signal carries two types of information. First, it allows player 1 to reason about the true fundamental of the game. That is, through its dependence on T_2 , Z_1 is correlated with nature's choice of a fundamental. Second, and more importantly, Z_1 allows player 1 to look *directly* at T_2 . In turn, this direct look at T_2 informs him about the probability with which player 2 plays A or B . In the following main propositions 3, 5 and 6, we show that this “direct look” at the other player's signal will induce asymmetric equilibria, in which players weight their signals Z and T differently. That is, if player 1 conditions his actions mainly on his primary signal T_1 , then player 2 will have an incentive to weight signal Z_2 heavily and vice versa. Put differently, the signals T_i, Z_j are complements, while the signals T_i, T_j are substitutes.

To underscore the significance of these asymmetric equilibria, we proceed in three steps. First, we show that they exist. Second, we describe the symmetric equilibria, where agents weight their signals symmetrically. Third, we show that the asymmetric equilibria welfare-dominate symmetric equilibria. Before we study the asymmetric equilibria, we note that the Rubinstein (1989) equilibrium carries over to the environment where agents receive primary and secondary signals.

Proposition 2. *When information Z_1 and Z_2 are available to players, there exists an equilibrium in which both players play A irrespective of the information received.*

⁴See Carlsson and van Damme (1993), pp. 1008-1010, for a detailed discussion of the relation between global games and mail games.

Proof. Suppose player 1 thinks that player 2 plays A for sure. Irrespective of (T_1, Z_1) , the following holds: Choosing B will yield a payoff $-L$, while taking action A will secure him a payoff of M . The same argument can be made for player 2, and thus we have established that the strategy profile (A, A) is an equilibrium. $\square$

In this equilibrium, both players receive a zero payoff, even in those situations where they know that playing (B, B) would yield a higher payoff. However, players can use their private signals to coordinate on an alternative class of equilibria:

Proposition 3. *If the secondary signals' precision is sufficiently high (ψ sufficiently small), there exist two asymmetric threshold equilibria for every $n \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. In one equilibrium, player 1 plays B if and only if $T_1 \geq n + 1$ and $Z_1 \geq n$; player 2 plays B if and only if $Z_2 \geq n + 1$ and $T_2 \geq n$. In the second equilibrium player 1 plays B if and only if $Z_1 \geq n + 1$ and $T_2 \geq n$ and player 2 plays B if and only if $T_2 \geq n + 1$ and $Z_2 \geq n$.*

Proof. Let us consider the first equilibrium with cutoff n .

1. Take the behavior of player 2 as given. There are three cases to consider:

- (a) $T_1 < n$: Player 1 is sure that $Z_2 \leq n$ and hence plays A .
- (b) $T_1 = n$: With probability $1 - \psi$ (ψ) player 2's information is $Z_2 = n$ ($Z_2 = n + 1$). Playing A secures a payoff of zero for sure; playing B yields an expected payoff larger than $(1 - \psi)(-L) + \psi M$, which is the first player's payoff from B , when player 2 always plays B given $Z_2 > n$. Thus, for $\psi \leq \frac{L}{L+M} =: \psi_1$ playing A is optimal.
- (c) $T_1 \geq n + 1$: Player 1 is sure that $Z_2 \geq n + 1$ and $T_2 \geq n$, hence finds it optimal to play B .

2. Equivalently, now take the behavior of player 1 as given.

- (a) $Z_2 \leq n$: Player 2 knows that $T_1 \leq n$, and thus plays A .
- (b) $Z_2 > n + 1$: Player 2 knows that $T_1 \geq n + 1$, and thus plays B .
- (c) $Z_2 = n + 1$: Here we have to take care of four subcases:
 - i. $T_2 = n - 1$: Hence $T_1 = n$ for sure and player 2 thus chooses A .

- ii. $T_2 = n$: Defining $\lambda_\psi := P(T_1 \leq n | T_2 = n \wedge Z_2 = n + 1) = \frac{\psi}{\psi + \frac{1-\epsilon}{2}(1-\psi)}$, the payoff for playing B can be written as $\lambda_\psi(-L) + (1 - \lambda_\psi)M$. From this we obtain a boundary $\psi_2 := \frac{(1-\epsilon)M}{2L - (1-\epsilon)M} > 0$, which ensures that for all $\psi \leq \psi_2$ playing B is optimal for player 2. That is, for $\psi \leq \psi_2$ the expected payoff of playing B is non-negative.
- iii. $T_2 = n + 1$: We can repeat the same argument using $\mu_\psi := P(T_1 \leq n | T_2 = n + 1 \wedge Z_2 = n + 1) = \frac{\psi}{\psi + (1-\epsilon)(1-\psi)}$. It holds that $\mu_\psi < \lambda_\psi$, such that for all $\psi \leq \psi_2$ playing B is optimal for player 2.
- iv. $T_2 = n + 2$: Hence $T_1 = n + 1$ for sure, and player 2 chooses B .

Again, we can choose ψ sufficiently small, i.e. $\psi \leq \min\{\psi_1, \psi_2\}$, such that the strategy profile from the proposition is indeed an equilibrium.

The second part of the proposition follows immediately from changing the roles of player 1 and 2. $\square$

To interpret the equilibria in Proposition 3 we note that players weight primary and secondary signals asymmetrically. That is, if player 1 switches from playing A to playing B for signal pairs $T_1 \geq n + 1, Z_1 \geq n$, then player 2 switches from A to B for signal values $T_2 \geq n, Z_2 \geq n + 1$. And, as the proof shows, signals where the trigger strategy requires values greater or equal $n + 1$ carry the main information regarding the other player's signals and actions. On the contrary, signals where the trigger strategy requires values greater or equal n carry little information on other player's signals. More precisely, player 1 relies in his inference about the other player's action on the fact that $T_1 \geq n + 1$ informs him of the fact that $T_2 \geq n, Z_2 \geq n + 1$. Hence, player 1 relies on his primary signal to infer the action of player 2. The main reason for player 1's reliance on his primary signal T_1 , is that player 2 conditions his actions on $T_2 \geq n, Z_2 \geq n + 1$. That is, as the steps 2.(c)i–iv in the proof show, player 2 relies on his secondary signal to infer the action of player 1. In turn, player 1's reliance on the secondary signal 1 justifies player 2's reliance on the primary signal... This complementarity between player 1's primary and player 2's secondary signal ensures that asymmetric weighting of signals is an equilibrium. Put differently, players face a coordination game in the weighting of their private signals; players can *choose their cutoff values T_i, Z_i in a way that makes it easy for their counterpart to assess whether their requirement for playing B is met or not.* In the present case, this means leaning on the primary signal once the opponent leans on the secondary signal and vice versa.

The main purpose of the following propositions 4-6 is to emphasize this point further. First, we show that there also exist symmetric equilibria, where agents weight their signals equally. Moreover, we show that not every configuration of cutoffs is an equilibrium. Second, we show in proposition 5 that the coordination game in the evaluation of private signals ensures multiple equilibria once private signals are of high quality. Finally, to bring-out the fact that the precision with which agents can anticipate each others actions is endogenous, we show in proposition 6 that the asymmetric equilibria, where agents exploit the complementarity between primary and secondary signals, welfare dominate the symmetric equilibria of proposition 4.

Proposition 4. *If the secondary signals' precision is sufficiently high, there exist symmetric monotone equilibria for every $n \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, where players weight their signals equally such that both players play B if and only if $T_i \geq n + 1$ and $Z_i \geq n + 1$. There exist no symmetric monotone equilibria, where both players play B if and only if $T_i \geq n + 1$ and $Z_i \geq n + 2$ (or $T_i \geq n + 2$ and $Z_i \geq n + 1$).*

Proof. See Appendix B. □

Up to now we have shown that our main results hold for a given probability ϵ that a message between the players is lost. One might suspect⁵ that equilibrium multiplicity depends on the relative precision of primary and secondary signals, i.e., a high ϵ/ψ ratio may be required. The following proposition shows that this is not the case:

Proposition 5. *There exist upper bounds $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ and $\bar{\psi} > 0$, such that the equilibria described in propositions 3 and 4 exist for all combinations of $\epsilon \leq \bar{\epsilon}$ and $\psi \leq \bar{\psi}$.*

Proof. For propositions 3 and 4 to hold, we need a sufficiently small error probability for the secondary signal, i.e., $\psi \leq \min[\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3]$, where $\psi_1 = \frac{L}{L+M}$, $\psi_2 = \frac{(1-\epsilon)M}{2L-(1-\epsilon)M}$, and $\psi_3 = \frac{(1-\epsilon)M}{L+(1-\epsilon)M}$. It therefore suffices to show that the limits of ψ_1, ψ_2, ψ_3 for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ are positive: First, observe that ψ_1 is positive and does not depend on ϵ . Second, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \psi_2 = \frac{M}{2L-M} > 0$. Finally, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \psi_3 = \frac{M}{L+M} > 0$. □

This demonstrates, that our results differ fundamentally from those obtained by Rubinstein (1989), Carlsson and van Damme (1993), Frankel et al. (2003), and Morris and Shin

⁵In the public and private information frameworks of Hellwig (2002), Morris and Shin (2004), and Angeletos and Werning (2006), multiple equilibria emerge once public signals or priors are sufficiently precise *relative* to private signals.

(2007), where equilibrium selection works best once private information is very precise. The present analysis, in particular Proposition 3, shows that once agents receive different types of information there emerges a coordination game in the evaluation of this information. And this incentive to coordinate is particularly strong once private signals are very informative.

In the introduction, we argued that the asymmetric equilibria derived here deserve special scrutiny. We believe that the main reason for this lies in the following

Proposition 6. *If the secondary private signals are very precise, the asymmetric equilibria described in Proposition 3 for $n = 1$ welfare-dominate those where $n > 1$. And, more importantly, the asymmetric equilibria of Proposition 3 welfare-dominate the symmetric ones of Proposition 4 for every given cutoff n .*

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Proposition 6 emphasizes the complementarity between primary and secondary signal that gave rise to the asymmetric equilibria of proposition 3: Private signals of high quality induce for players to coordinate on an equilibrium, where they exploit the complementarity between primary and secondary signals to reduce losses that occur in cases where nature selects game b , but players play (A, A) , or, worse, (A, B) .

4 Discussion

The players of Rubinstein (1989) and Carlsson and van Damme (1993) rely on a very particular type of information. Players can only reason *indirectly* about each other's trembling behavior because the private information on the game's unknown coefficient, is correlated. That is, players purely rely on the knowledge that the other player is looking at the same game. They cannot make *direct* inference on what the other player thinks of the game. In reality, we argue that there are many environments where players know more than that. In the coordinated attack interpretation of the mail game, players may observe directly that their messenger is off to a "bad start", in which case it is unlikely that he will deliver his message. Similarly, one general may see that someone is leaving the other general's camp, which leads him to believe that the other general is trying to send him a message. If, in turn, no message arrives, it is likely that game b was selected,

but that the primary message was lost. The analysis of such an information structure that comprises “primary signals”, as in the Rubinstein (1989) game and “secondary signals”, which inform players of the chance that their primary messages were received, indicates that more general signal structures can reverse the intended equilibrium selection effect: multiple equilibria are ensured once private information is very precise.

In the present example, we find that players face a coordination game regarding the way that they use their information to reason about each other’s actions. Put differently, the extent to which player i trembles from the perspective of player j depends on the way that i weights his information and vice versa. Accordingly, signals with heterogeneous informational content induce a coordination game with regard to the way that agents evaluate their information. In the present specification, there is a complementarity between player i ’s primary signal and player j ’s secondary signal: if i leans on his primary signal, then j can forecast i ’s tremble best through the secondary signal and vice versa. As we show, this complementarity gives rise to two classes of equilibria. Moreover, within each equilibrium class, there exists a countably infinite number of equilibria if the private signal’s precisions are large. That is, while precise private signals ensure uniqueness in Rubinstein (1989) and Carlsson and van Damme (1993), they ensure multiplicity in the present class of games. Finally, the asymmetric equilibria that arise under the present extended signal structure cannot be dismissed on efficiency grounds. In the current model asymmetric equilibria dominate symmetric ones in terms of efficiency.

The current analysis is confined to the simple Rubinstein (1989) game with its discrete information structure. This restriction allows us to give a constructive proof for the existence of asymmetric equilibria and it allows us to make a welfare comparison showing that asymmetric equilibria welfare-dominate their symmetric counterparts. A generalization to the continuous “global games” structure is therefore left for future research.

References

- Angeletos, G.-M. and Werning, I. (2006). Crises and prices: Information aggregation, multiplicity, and volatility. *American Economic Review*, 96(5):1720–1736.
- Binmore, K. and Samuelson, L. (2001). Coordinated action in the electronic mail game. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 35:6–30.
- Carlsson, H. and van Damme, E. (1993). Global games and equilibrium selection. *Econometrica*, 61:989–1018.
- Dasgupta, A. (2007). Coordination and delay in global games. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 134(1):195–225.
- Frankel, D., Morris, S., and Pauzner, A. (2003). Equilibrium selection in global games with strategic complementarities. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 102(1):1–44.
- Harsanyi, J. C. (1973). Games with randomly disturbed payoffs: A new rationale for mixed strategy equilibrium points. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 2:1–23.
- Hellwig, C. (2002). Public information, private information, and the multiplicity of equilibria in coordination games. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 107:191–222.
- Kuhle, W. (2013). A global game with heterogenous priors. *arXiv*, 1312.7860v1:1–25.
- Metz, C. (2002). Public and private information in self-fulfilling currency crises. *Journal of Economics*, 76:65–85.
- Minelli, E. and Polemarchakis, H. (2003). Information at equilibrium. *Economic Theory*, 21(2-3):573–584.
- Morris, S. and Shin, H. S. (2004). Coordination risk and the price of debt. *European Economic Review*, 48(1):133–153.
- Morris, S. and Shin, H. S. (2007). Common belief foundations of global games. *Working-paper*, pages 1–49.
- Rubinstein, A. (1989). The electronic mail game: Strategic behaviour under ‘almost common knowledge’. *American Economic Review*, 79(3):385–391.

Selten, R. (1975). Reexamination of the perfectness concept for equilibrium points in extensive games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 4:25–55.

A Proof of Proposition 1

The proof is parallel to the one in Rubinstein (1989). First, we establish that player i plays A when $T_i = 0$. Player i considers two possible scenarios:

1. With probability $(1 - p)$, game G_a is played.
2. With probability $\frac{1}{2}p\epsilon$, Player j was selected, game G_b is played, and the message from player j to player i was lost.

Hence, we find a lower bound $\tilde{A}$ for i 's payoff from playing A and an upper bound $\tilde{B}$ for i 's payoff from playing B :

$$\pi(A) \geq \frac{(1-p)M + \frac{1}{2}p\epsilon 0}{(1-p) + \frac{1}{2}p\epsilon} =: \tilde{A} \qquad \pi(B) \leq \frac{-(1-p)L + \frac{1}{2}p\epsilon M}{(1-p) + \frac{1}{2}p\epsilon} =: \tilde{B}$$

It holds that $\tilde{A} > \tilde{B}$, and thus player i plays A . The induction step from $t - 1$ to t is identical to the original Rubinstein one: assume that both players play A when they receive a $T_i < t$. Consider that player i gets information $T_i = t$. For the following argument we denote the probability that player i was informed first that game G_b is played by $\kappa_t \in [0, 1]$. The posterior probability of player j having received information $T_j = t - 1$ is given by

$$z_t := \frac{\kappa_t \epsilon + 1 - \kappa_t}{\kappa_t(\epsilon + (1 - \epsilon)\epsilon) + 1 - \kappa_t} > \frac{1}{2}.$$

In other words, the posterior probability of player j playing A is larger than $\frac{1}{2}$, and thus playing A is optimal for player i as well: Playing A yields 0, while playing B has expected payoff $z_t(-L) + (1 - z_t)M < 0$.

B Proof of Proposition 4

We start by proving the first statement. Without loss of generality, we have to check only if player i 's best response to player j 's equilibrium strategy is consistent with player i 's equilibrium strategy. We have to check the following cases of information that player i might receive:

1. $Z_i \leq n$: Player i knows that $T_j \leq Z_i \leq n$ and that j player A , hence plays A .
2. $Z_i = n + 1$:
 - (a) $T_i = n$: player i knows that $Z_j = n$ and that player j plays A , which leads j to play A as well.
 - (b) $T_i = n + 1$: Clearly $Z_j \geq n + 1$ and $T_j \in \{n, n + 1\}$. To determine the payoff of playing B , the conditional distribution of T_j has to be taken into account:

$$\frac{(1 - \epsilon)^{2n} \epsilon \psi}{(1 - \epsilon)^{2n} \epsilon \psi + (1 - \epsilon)^{2n+1} \epsilon (1 - \psi)} (-L) + \frac{(1 - \epsilon)^{2n+1} \epsilon (1 - \psi)}{(1 - \epsilon)^{2n} \epsilon \psi + (1 - \epsilon)^{2n+1} \epsilon (1 - \psi)} M.$$
 Hence playing B is optimal if $\psi < \psi_3 := \frac{(1 - \epsilon)M}{L + (1 - \epsilon)M}$.
 - (c) $T_i > n + 1$: thus $Z_j \geq n + 2$ and $T_j \geq n + 2$. Player j plays B and the optimal response of i is B .
3. $Z_i = n + 2$: Player i knows that $T_j \geq n + 1$.
 - (a) $Z_i = n + 2$ implies that $T_i < n$ is not feasible.
 - (b) $T_i = n$: $Z_j \geq n + 1$ with probability ψ , hence the payoff of playing B is $(1 - \psi)(-L) + \psi M$, which is negative for $\psi < \psi_1$, the case when playing A is optimal for player i .
 - (c) $T_i > n$: Therefore $Z_j \geq n + 1$ for sure, and thus both players play B .
4. $Z_i > n + 2$: Player i knows that $T_j \geq Z_i - 1 > n + 1$. It also holds that $T_i \geq n + 1$ and thus $Z_j \geq n + 1$. Therefore player j plays B and player i 's best response is to play B as well.

Hence we have established the first part of the proposition for $\psi \leq \min\{\psi_1, \psi_3\}$.

To prove the second part of the proposition we provide a counter example: Suppose $Z_1 = n + 1$ and $T_1 = n + 2$: player 1 now plays A . This is not a best response since player 1 knows that $T_2 \geq n + 1$ and $Z_2 \geq n + 2$, and thus that 2 plays B with certainty. Hence, equilibria where players play B iff $T_i \geq n + 1$ and $Z_i \geq n + 2$ cannot exist.

C Proof of Proposition 6

We will compute the total welfare loss in the asymmetric equilibria of Proposition 3 given n (sum of expected surplus losses of player 1 and 2) compared to hypothetical perfect

coordination between both players. Note that in state a neither miscoordination nor coordination on the wrong action can occur. In state b

1. coordination on the wrong action (A, A) happens with probability

$$p \left[1 - (1 - \epsilon)^{2(n-1)} + (1 - \epsilon)^{2(n-1)} \epsilon (1 + (1 - \psi)(1 - \epsilon)) + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \epsilon)^{2n} (1 - \psi) \right]$$

2. miscoordination (B, A) happens when $T_1 = n$, $T_2 \geq n$, and $Z_2 = n + 1$. The associated probability is $p(1 - \epsilon)^{2n-1} \epsilon \psi$.

Using this, we can compute the welfare loss in equilibrium:

$$\begin{aligned} l_n &:= p \left\{ (1 - \epsilon)^{2n-1} \epsilon \psi (2M + L) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left[1 - (1 - \epsilon)^{2(n-1)} + (1 - \epsilon)^{2(n-1)} \epsilon (1 + (1 - \psi)(1 - \epsilon)) + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \epsilon)^{2n} (1 - \psi) \right] 2M \right\} \\ &= p(1 - \epsilon)^{2n-1} \left\{ \epsilon \psi (2M + L) + \left[-1 + \epsilon (1 + (1 - \psi)(1 - \epsilon)) + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \epsilon)^2 (1 - \psi) \right] 2M \right\} + p2M. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to see that the expression in curly brackets is negative for small ψ . Hence, l_n is increasing in n for small ψ .

The remaining part of the proof requires computing the welfare loss in the symmetric equilibria of Proposition 3 given n . Again there are two types of losses:

1. coordination on the wrong action (A, A) happens with probability

$$p \left[1 - (1 - \epsilon)^{2n} + (1 - \epsilon)^{2n} \epsilon (1 - \psi) \right]$$

2. miscoordination (B, A) happens once $T_1 = n$, $T_2 \geq n$, and $Z_2 = n + 1$. Hence it happens with probability $p(1 - \epsilon)^{2(n-1)} \epsilon \psi$.

Using these probabilities, we compute the welfare loss in equilibrium:

$$\tilde{l}_n = p(1 - \epsilon)^{2(n-1)} \left\{ \epsilon \psi (2M + L) + (1 - \epsilon)^2 [-1 + \epsilon(1 - \psi)] 2M \right\} + p2M$$

Note that $l_n - \tilde{l}_n \xrightarrow{\psi \rightarrow 0} -p(1 - \epsilon)^{2n} \epsilon M < 0$. Hence, for a small enough ψ it holds that $l_n < \tilde{l}_n$, i.e., welfare is higher in the asymmetric equilibria given n .

D Referee appendix

In this appendix we show that our main result, multiplicity of equilibria in the presence of primary and secondary signals, holds for the original asymmetric version of the electronic mail game of Rubinstein (1989). That is, we now assume that it is always player 1 who gets informed first, i.e., gets a message in case nature draws game b . Equivalently, we set the probability P , with which player 1 is informed first to $P = 1$ (rather than $1/2$, which is what we assumed in the main text). Other than that leave the signals Z, T unchanged. Our only deviation from Rubinstein (1989) is therefore the introduction of the secondary signal Z . Naturally, Proposition 2 holds without modification of the proof.

We now show for this simplified setting that multiple equilibria exist as in the main text. In particular, we prove that the asymmetric equilibria described in Proposition 3 still exist:

Proposition 7. *There exists an asymmetric threshold equilibria for every $n \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ for small enough ψ : player 1 plays B if and only if $T_1 \geq n + 1$ and player 2 plays B if and only if $Z_2 \geq n + 1$ and $T_2 \geq n$.*

Proof. The proof is mostly unchanged compared to the proof of Proposition 3. There are two exceptions:

2. Equivalently, now take the behavior of player 1 as given.

(c) $Z_2 = n + 1$: Here we have to take care of four subcases:

- ii. $T_2 = n$: Note that $P(T_1 = n | T_2 = n \wedge Z_2 = n + 1) = \psi$, and thus, the payoff of playing B is given by $\psi(-L) + (1 - \psi)M$. From this we can determine $\bar{\psi}_2 := \frac{M}{L+M} > 0$ such that for all $\psi \leq \bar{\psi}_2$ playing B is optimal for player 2, i.e. where the expected payoff of playing B is non-negative.
- iii. $T_2 > n$: Hence $T_1 \geq n + 1$ for sure, player 2 chooses B .

Again, we can choose a small enough ψ , i.e., $\psi \leq \min\{\psi_1, \bar{\psi}_2\}$, such that the strategy profile from the proposition is indeed an equilibrium. $\square$